Ontario
Provincial Parks

Quetico Provincial Park Interior Survey Statistical Summary

1984

Ontario
Ministry of
Natural
Resources

1984 Quetico Provincial Park Interior Survey Summary

Statistical Report

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	List of Tables	ii
1.	Introduction	1
2.	Characteristics of Park Users	3
3.	Extent of Park Usage	7
4.	Travel Data	13
5.	Outfitting Services and Related Expenditures	17
6.	Marketing Information	21
7.	Management Issues	23
8.	Reservation Service	35
9.	Canoe Route Map and Park Literature	39
10.	Interior Regulations	43
11.	Fishing Census	45
	Appendix: 1984 Quetico Provincial Park Interior Survey Questionnaire	57
	1984 Quetico Provincial Park Survey Map	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2.1	Party Type of Interior Users	4
2.2	Group Size of Interior Users	5
2.3	Travelling Party Size of Interior Users	6
3.1	Previous Visit to Quetico	8
3.2	Number of Visits to Quetico Last Year (1983)	9
3.3	Number of Days Spent in Quetico Last Year (1983)	10
3.4	Number of Nights Camped in Quetico (1983)	11
3.5	Number of Different Interior Campsites Used	12
4.1	Permanent Residence of Interior Users by M.N.R. Region	14
4.2	Purpose of Visit	15
5.1	Familiar with the Ontario Commercial Outfitting	18
5.2	Use of Ontario Outfitting Services	19
5.3	Outfitting Services Expenditures	19
5.4	Potential Use of Aircraft Dropoff and Pick-up	20
6.1	What Prompted Visit	22
7.1	Experienced Crowding in the Interior	24
7.2	Acceptability of Float Planes	25
7.3	Trip Affected by Aircraft Flights	25
7.4	Reasons Trip Affected by Aircraft Flights	25
7.5	Reduction in Group Size	26
7.6	Reasons Disagree with Reduction in Group Size	26
7.7	Litter Control Problems	27
7.8	Litter Control Suggestions	28
7.9	Installation of Box Toilets	29

		Page
7.10	Management of Portages	30
7.11	Recommendations for Management of Portages	31
7.12	Management of Hiking Trails	31
7.13	Recommendations for Management of Hiking Trails	31
7.14	Management of Campsites	32
7.15	Recommendations for Management of Campsites	32
7.16	Satisfaction with Park Staff	33
7.17	Recommendations for Improved Staff Relations	33
7.18	Park Ranger Contact	34
8.1	Awareness of Reservation Service	36
8.2	Use of Reservation Service	36
8.3	Acceptance of First Choice on Entry Point and Starting Date	36
8.4	Satisfaction with Reservation Service	36
8.5	Suggested Improvements to Reservation Service	37
9.1	Satisfaction with Information on Canoe Route Map	40
9.2	Suggested Improvements to Canoe Route Map	40
9.3	Adequacy of Park Literature	41
9.4	Suggested Improvements to Park Literature	41
9.5	Willingness to Pay for Park Literature	41
10.1	Awareness of Can and Bottle Ban	44
10.2	Awareness of Restriction on Live Bait Fishing	44
10.3	Awareness of Restriction on Group Size	44
10.4	Awareness of Outboard Motor Ban	44
11.1	Species of Fish Caught	46
11.2	Lakes where Species Caught	47

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

The information presented in this statistical report summarizes data collected from May to September 1984, as part of the on-going provincial park user survey program. This program was established in 1974 to provide current information for a variety of planning, research and operational/management functions. This is the first year that the Quetico Provincial Park Interior has been surveyed under this program.

Analyses of the data and the printing of the individual tables contained herein were performed through the utilization of the Statistical Analysis System (SAS) software package.

The interior survey was administered by the Quetico Park staff from the six ranger stations on a day-to-day basis. Every interior group purchasing an interior permit was asked to complete a questionnaire. A return rate of 29% was achieved (1232 returns from 4194 distributed) and forms the basis of the sample.

The questionnaire was designed in a self-administered format, being completed during the visitors stay in the interior and returned either at one of the ranger stations or to the Parks and Recreational Areas Branch in Toronto.

Questions contained in the survey obtained information on the characteristics of interior users including: the extent of park usage, travel data, Outfitting services and expenditures, marketing information, park perception, reservation service, interior regulations and fishing census (see Appendix for copy of Questionnaire).

Should more detailed or specific data be required, please contact the Parks and Recreational Areas Branch in Toronto.

SECTION 2

CHARACTERISTICS OF PARK USERS

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV.PARK

TYPE OF PARTY

(1231 CASES - 99.9%)

TABLE 2.1

FAMILY	19.7%
COUPLE	21.6%
GROUP	16.6%
FRIENDS	37.2%
SINGLE	2.0%
OTHER	2.8%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
OUETICO PROV. PARK

GROUP SIZE

(1221 CASES - 99.6%)

TABLE 2.2

1	1.9%
2	35.2%
3	8.0%
4	18.6%
5	5.6%
6	12.1%
7	4.2%
8+	14.3%
AVERAGE	4.24

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

TRAVELLING PARTY SIZE

(263 CASES = 21.4%)

TABLE 2.3

1	2.3%
2	14.8%
3	5.3%
4	9.9%
5	2.3%
6	8.7%
7	2.3%
8	3.0%
9	3.4%
10	2.3%
11	1.5%
12	6.1%
13	2.3%
14	3.4%
15	4.6%
16	8.4%
17	4.2%
18	6.1%
19+	9.1%
AVERAGE	10.73

SECTION 3

EXTENT OF PARK USAGE

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

PREVIOUS VISIT TO PARK

(1224 CASES - 99.4%)

TABLE 3.1

YES	71.0%
NO	29.0%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

NUMBER OF VISITS
LAST YEAR (1983)

(458 CASES - 37.2%)

TABLE 3.2

VISTS	
1	79.5%
2	13.7%
3	2.6%
4	1.5%
5	0.4%
6	0.4%
7	0.4%
8+	1.3%
AVERAGE	1.45

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

NUMBER OF DAYS
VISITED LAST YEAR (1983)

(457 CASES - 37.1%)

TABLE 3.3

DAYS	
1	0.9%
2	0.9%
3	2.4%
4-7	45.9%
8-14	38.2%
15-21	7.3%
21+	4.4%
AVERAGE	9.19

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

NUMBER OF NIGHTS CAMPED

(1226 CASES - 99.5%)

TABLE 3.4

NIGHTS	
1	0.8%
2	3.7%
3	7.1%
4-7	61.2%
8-14	25.9%
15+	1.3%
AVERAGE	6.45

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

NUMBER OF DIFFERENT CAMPSITES USED

(1220 CASES = 99.0%)

TABLE 3.5

CAMPSITES	
1	11.6%
2	11.6%
3	15.3%
4	15.4%
5	15.8%
6	10.1%
7	8.7%
8+	11.4%
AVERAGE	4.55

SECTION 4

TRAVEL DATA

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

LOCATION OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE
BY MINISTRY REGION

(1194 CASES - 96.9%)

TABLE 4.1

N.W. REGION	0.3%	
N.C. REGION	3.6%	
N. REGION	0.0%	
N.E. REGION	0.2%	
A. REGION	0.3%	
E. REGION	0.7%	
C. REGION	3.9%	
S.W. REGION	0.3%	
BORDER PROVINCES		
MANITOBA		1.9%
QUEBEC		0.2%
OTHER CANADA	0.7%	
BORDER STATES		
MICHIGAN		2.9%
MINNESOTA		19.5%
NEW YORK STATE		0.7%
OHIO		3.5%
PENNSYLVANIA		0.8%
WISCONSIN		12.4%
OTHER U.S.A.		
ALABAMA		1.7%
CALIFORNIA		1.1%
COLORADO		2.8%
ILLINOIS		18.6%
INDIANA		4.5%
IOWA		2.5%
KANSAS		1.6%
MISSOURI		2.8%
TEXAS		2.2%
OTHER (< 1%)		10.1%
OTHER	0.6%	

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

PURPOSE OF VISIT

(1175 CASES - 95.4%)

TABLE 4.2

	1st	2nd	
CANOEING	14.8	12.6	14.1%
FISHING	19.3	31.5	23.4%
CAMPING	5.9	17.6	9.9%
SWIMMING	0.0	0.3	0.1%
HIKING	0.0	0.2	0.1%
NATURE STUDY	1.5	2.5	1.9%
WILDERNESS EXPERIENCE	17.9	14.8	16.8%
RELAXATION	6.6	6.0	6.4%
ORGANIZED GROUP TRIP	5.6	2.0	4.4%
SIGHTSEEING	0.9	3.0	1.6%
PHOTOGRAPHY	0.2	1.0	0.4%
ADVENTURE/CHALLENGE	2.2	2.9	2.4%
RECREATION/VACATION	23.1	4.7	16.2%
OTHER	1.9	1.2	1.6%

SECTION 5

OUTFITTING SERVICES AND RELATED EXPENDITURES

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

FAMILIAR WITH ONTARIO COMMERCIAL SERVICES
(1210 CASES - 98.2%)

TABLE 5.1

YES	56.3%
NO	43.7%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

USE OF ONTARIO OUTFITTING SERVICES

(1212 CASES - 98.4%)

TABLE 5.2

YES	18.5%
NO	81.5%

OUTFITTING SERVICES EXPENDITURES

(297 CASES - 24.1%)

TABLE 5.3

<$75	338.7%
$75-149	12.5%
$150-224	15.2%
$225-299	6.7%
$300-374	9.4%
$375-449	6.1%
$450+	26.3%
AVERAGE	$314.61

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

IF AVAILABLE, USE OF AIRCRAFT
DROP-OFF AND PICK-UP

(1117 CASES = 90.7%)

TABLE 5.4

YES	26.9%
NO	73.1%

SECTION 6

MARKETING INFORMATION

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

WHAT PROMPTED VISIT

(1223 CASES - 99.3%)

TABLE 6.1

MAGAZINE ARTICLE/ADVERTISEMENT	1.6%
NEWSPAPER ARTICLE/ADVERTISEMENT	0.4%
RADIO, TV ADVERTISEMENT	0.1%
PROVINCIAL PARKS PUBLICATION	1.1%
PREVIOUS TRIPS TO QUETICO INTERIOR	64.3%
QUETICO 75TH ANNIVERSARY	0.2%
FRIEND/RELATIVE	16.9%
ROAD SIGN/MAP	0.6%
COMMERCIAL OUTFITTER	4.5%
PARKS/TOURISM INFORMATION CENTRE	0.7%
OTHER	9.4%

SECTION 7

MANAGEMENT ISSUES

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

EXPERIENCE CROWDING

TABLE 7.1

	YES %	NO %	
	25.1	74.9	
IF YES, WHERE?			
EN ROUTE	46.8	53.2	(331 CASES - 20.9%)
AT CAMPSITES	47.7	52.3	(327 CASES - 26.5%)
AT PORTAGES	57.8	42.2	(334 CASES - 27.1%)

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

EFFECT OF AIRCRAFT FLIGHTS ON TRIPS

FLOAT PLANES ACCEPTABLE

(1215 CASES - 98.6%)

TABLE 7.2

AGREE	31.9%
DISAGREE	58.3%
NO OPINION	9.9%

TRIP AFFECTED BY AIRCRAFT FLIGHTS

(1208 CASES - 98.1%)

TABLE 7.3

YES	27.2%
NO	72.8%

REASONS TRIP AFFECTED BY AIRCRAFT FLIGHTS

(293 CASES - 23.8%)

TABLE 7.4

TOO NOISY	30.4%
DESTROYS WILDERNESS SETTING	26.2%
FLEW TOO LOW	4.7%
TOO FREQUENT	22.3%
REASSURING TO SEE PLANES	2.2%
ENJOY WATCHING PLANES	0.8%
USED FLY-IN ACCESS TO PARK	2.2%
LIKE TO SEE PARK STAFF PLANES ONLY	3.6%
OTHER	7.5%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

REDUCTION IN GROUP SIZE

AGREE IN REDUCTION IN GROUP SIZE

(1203 CASES 97.7%)

TABLE 7.5

YES	71.4%
NO	28.6%

REASONS DISAGREE WITH REDUCTION IN GROUP SIZE

(253 CASES - 20.5%)

TABLE 7.6

LIMIT USE BY ORGANIZED YOUTH GROUPS	22.1%
SOME FAMILIES HAVE MORE THAN 6 MEMBERS	15.4%
6 TOO SMALL FOR SAFETY REASONS	1.2%
SOME CAMPSITES EASILY ACCOMMODATE 9	3.6%
LIMITS USE BY OTHER/ADULT GROUPS	23.3%
REDUCES # OF AVAILABLE CAMPSITES	3.6%
9 IS FINE, 6 TOO SMALL	14.2%
OTHER	16.6%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

LITTER CONTROL

TABLE 7.7

LITTER A PROBLEM, FIRST LOCATION

(1150 CASES - 93.3%)

CAMPSITES	30.2%
PORTAGES	7.0%
EN ROUTE	0.5%
ENTRY STATIONS	1.3%
ALL OF THE ABOVE	0.9%
NONE OF THE ABOVE	60.2%

LITTER A PROBLEM, SECOND LOCATION

(496 CASES - 40.3%)

CAMPSITES	16.5%
PORTAGES	24.0%
EN ROUTE	1.4%
ENTRY STATIONS	0.2%
ALL OF THE ABOVE	1.0%
NONE OF THE ABOVE	56.9%

LITTER A PROBLEM, THIRD LOCATION

(349 CASES - 28.3%)

CAMPSITES	13.8%
PORTAGES	3.2%
EN ROUTE	3.2%
ENTRY STATIONS	1.1%
ALL OF THE ABOVE	1.4%
NONE OF THE ABOVE	77.4%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

LITTER CONTROL SUGGESTIONS

(373 CASES - 30.3%)

TABLE 7.8

BAN TINFOIL PACKAGING	5.6%
MORE VISITOR EDUCATION	31.6%
MORE STRICT ENFORCEMENT	11.5%
ENCOURAGE GROUPS TO PICK UP OLD LITTER	5.6%
REQUIRE USE OF A SHOVEL	4.3%
IMPOSE FINES	3.2%
INSTALL BOX TOILETS/OUTHOUSES	4.8%
EMPHASIZE 'PACK IT IN-PACK IT OUT'	8.0%
OTHER	25.2%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

INSTALLATION OF BOX TOILETS

(1190 CASES - 96.6%)

TABLE 7.9

YES	28.6%
NO	64.7%
NO OPINION	6.7%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

MANAGEMENT OF PORTAGES

(1209 CASES - 98.1%)

TABLE 7.10

SATISFIED	75.9%
DISSATISFIED	19.7%
NO OPINION	4.4%

IF DISSATISFIED, RECOMMENDATIONS

(232 CASES - 18.8%)

TABLE 7.11

CLEAR DEADFALLS	30.6%
MORE CANOE RESTS	4.7%
CUT BUSH/GENERAL MAINTENANCE	21.1%
MARK DISTANCES MORE ACCURATELY	0.9%
MORE CLEARLY MARKED SIGNS	25.0%
BOARDWALKS ON MUDDY TRAILS	6.0%
STEEP GRADES STEPPED	0.9%
IMPROVE ACCESS TO PORTAGES	1.7%
OTHER	9.1%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

MANAGEMENT OF HIKING TRAILS

(1150 CASES - 93.3%)

TABLE 7.12

SATISFIED	33.5%
DISSATISFIED	1.6%
NO OPINION	65.0%

IF DISSATISFIED, RECOMMENDATIONS

(11 CASES - 0.9%)

TABLE 7.13

ADDITIONAL TRAILS	45.5%
MAKE TRAILS MORE EVIDENT	36.4%
MAINTENANCE	9.1%
OTHER	9.1%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

MANAGEMENT OF CAMPSITES

(1213 CASES - 98.5%)

TABLE 7.14

SATISFIED	89.8%
DISSATISFIED	9.2%
NO OPINION	1.1%

IF DISSATISFIED, RECOMMENDATIONS

(105 CASES - 8.5%)

TABLE 7.15

IMPROVE SANITATION	16.2%
MARK ON MAP	6.7%
CLEAN UP LITTER	24.8%
CAMPSITE SIGNAGE	1.0%
PERIODIC CLOSURES	16.2%
FIRE GRATES	8.6%
OTHER	26.7%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

SATISFACTION WITH PARK STAFF

(1213 CASES - 98.5%)

TABLE 7.16

SATISFIED	90.9%
DISSATISFIED	3.5%
NO OPINION	5.6%

IF DISSATISFIED, RECOMMENDATIONS

(33 CASES - 2.7%)

TABLE 7.17

COULD BE MORE HELPFUL	21.2%
NOT SEEN OFTEN ENOUGH	6.1%
LESS RUDE/MORE POLITE	51.5%
UNABLE TO ADVISE/INACCURATE INFORMATION	6.1%
OTHER	15.2%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

ENCOUNTERED RANGER

(1215 CASES - 98.6%)

TABLE 7.18

YES	17.7%
NO	82.3%

SECTION 8

RESERVATION SERVICE

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

AWARE OF RESERVATION SERVICE

(1222 CASES - 99.2%)

TABLE 6.1

YES	89.0%
NO	11.0%

USE OF RESERVATION SERVICE

(1076 CASES - 87.3%)

TABLE 6.2

YES	86.1%
NO	13.9%

FIRST CHOICE ON ENTRY POINT AND STARTING DATE ACCEPTED

(976 CASES - 79.2%)

TABLE 6.3

YES	79.6%
NO	20.4%

SATISFACTION WITH RESERVATION SERVICE

(963 CASES - 78.2%)

TABLE 6.4

YES	94.8%
NO	5.2%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS TO RESERVATION SERVICE

(161 CASES - 13.1%)

TABLE 8.5

ACCEPT U.S. FUNDS--CHEQUES/MONEY ORDER	18.0%
ALLOW PHONE-IN RESERVATIONS	8.1%
PROVIDE BETTER INFORMATION ON SERVICE	13.0%
PUT OUT APPLICATIONS EARLIER	3.7%
RESERVE CAMPSITE	0.6%
SELL MORE PERMITS	5.0%
FACILITATE PAYMENT FROM U.S.	2.5%
OTHER (MORE PERSONNEL, CREDIT CARDS, SEND PARK RULES)	49.1%

SECTION 9

CANOE ROUTE MAP AND PARK LITERATURE

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

CANOE ROUTE MAP

SATISFACTION WITH INFORMATION ON CANOE ROUTE MAP

(1179 CASES - 95.8%)

TABLE 9.1

YES	73.5%
NO	26.3%

IMPROVEMENTS TO CANOE ROUTE MAP

(287 CASES - 23.3%)

TABLE 9.2

MORE DETAIL	15.0%
MARK CAMPSITES	18.8%
MARK PORTAGES MORE ACCURATELY	18.5%
UPDATE/IMPROVE ACCURACY	23.0%
MARK CONTOUR LINES/ELEVATIONS	7.7%
IMPROVE DURABILITY OF MAP	1.4%
INDICATE FAST WATER	0.3%
DID NOT RECIEVE/UNAWARE	8.4%
OTHER	7.0%

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

PARK LITERATURE

ADEQUATE PARK LITERATURE

(1163 CASES - 94.4%)

TABLE 9.3

YES	86.2%
NO	13.8%

SUGGESTIONS TO PARK LITERATURE

(149 CASES - 12.1%)

TABLE 9.4

SEND LITERATURE WITH RESERVATION CONFIRMATION	7.5%
MORE INFORMATION ON RULES/CHECK-IN PROCEDURES	8.7%
IMPROVE ACCURACY	6.4%
INFORMATION ON GEOLOGY AND INDIAN HISTORY	15.6%
INFORMATION ON LOCATION OF WILDLIFE/PICTOGRAPHS	14.5%
INFORMATION FOR NOVICE FISHERMAN	2.3%
MORE DETAIL ON SITE MAINTENANCE	6.9%
MAKE LITERATURE MORE EVIDENT	14.5%
OTHER	23.7%

WILLING TO PAY FOR LITERATURE

(1175 CASES - 95.4%)

TABLE 9.5

YES	65.2%
NO	34.8%

SECTION 10

INTERIOR REGULATIONS

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

AWARE OF PARK RULES PRIOR TO ARRIVAL

AWARE OF CAN AND BOTTLE BAN

(1223 CASES -99.3%)

TABLE 10.1

YES	94.8%
NO	5.2%

AWARE OF RESTRICTION ON LIVE-BAIT FISHING

(1219 CASES -98.9%)

TABLE 10.2

YES	86.2%
NO	13.8%

AWARE OF RESTRICTION ON GROUP SIZE

(1221 CASES - 99.1%)

TABLE 10.3

YES	88.2%
NO	11.8%

AWARE OF OUTBOARD MOTOR BAN

(1220 CASES - 99.0%)

TABLE 10.4

YES	97.1%
NO	2.9%

SECTION 11

FISHING CENSUS

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY
QUETICO PROV. PARK

SPECIES OF FISH CAUGHT

(558 CASES - 45.3%)

TABLE 11.1

SPECIES	KEPT	RELEASED	CAUGHT	FISHING GROUPS	AVERAGE CAUGHT
WALLEYE	4535	5905	10440	698	15.0
SMALLMOUTH BASS	5981	15558	21539	921	23.4
NORTHERN PIKE	1677	6678	8355	783	10.7
LAKE TROUT	557	669	1226	228	5.4
SUCKER	0	27	27	6	4.5
ROCK-BASS	21	169	190	27	7.0
MUSKELUNGE	1	1	2	2	1.0
CARP	0	15	15	4	3.8
SUNFISH	11	31	42	6	7.0
WHITEFISH	9	13	22	15	1.5
BLUEGILL	84	48	132	11	12.0
PERCH	14	222	236	23	10.3
LARGEMOUTH BASS	230	344	574	46	12.48
OTHER	23	12	35	16	2.2
TOTAL ALL SPECIES	13143	29692	42835	2786	15.4

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

LAKES	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
AGNES LAKE	46	371	83	1173	31	182	21	115	6	29	187	1867	9.98
ALICE LAKE	1	7	1	299	2	22	0	0	0	0	4	328	82.00
ANTOINE LAKE	3	82	3	47	2	17	1	5	0	0	9	151	16.77
ARGO LAKE	1	1	6	76	3	10	11	37	1	1	22	125	5.68
BADWATER LAKE	4	54	2	20	4	15	0	0	0	0	10	89	8.90
BALLARD LAKE	5	65	3	43	0	0	0	0	2	56	10	164	16.40
BAPTISM LAKE	0	0	0	0	3	39	0	0	0	0	3	39	13.00
BART LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	3	3.00
BASSWOOD LAKE	30	256	43	1200	48	439	5	55	2	3	128	1953	15.25
BATCHEWAUNG LAKE	6	32	32	472	15	80	9	37	3	25	65	646	9.93
BEARPELT LAKE	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	13.00
BEAVERHOUSE LAKE	3	53	10	104	6	77	6	36	0	0	25	270	10.80
BEG LAKE	3	4	3	7	4	11	0	0	0	0	10	22	2.20
BELL LAKE	0	0	1	1	3	7	0	0	2	3	6	11	1.83

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
BENTPINE CREEK	2	53	1	15	2	38	0	0	0	0	5	106	21.20
BIRCH LAKE	2	7	5	17	3	4	1	8	1	3	12	39	3.25
BIRD LAKE	1	23	5	41	2	10	0	0	0	0	8	74	9.25
BISK LAKE	1	5	1	18	2	5	0	0	0	0	4	28	4.00
BRENT LAKE	11	250	17	164	16	130	5	29	0	0	49	573	11.69
BUCKINGHAM LAKE	4	16	4	41	1	2	0	0	1	1	10	60	6.00
BUD LAKE	5	100	3	125	4	37	0	0	0	0	12	262	21.83
BURKE LAKE	3	6	28	407	6	8	5	18	4	53	46	492	10.69
BURNTSIDE LAKE	5	23	5	42	7	44	0	0	0	0	17	109	6.41
BURT LAKE	4	32	6	98	2	8	3	28	0	0	15	166	11.06
CACHE BAY	0	0	4	93	2	27	0	0	1	1	7	121	17.28
CACHE LAKE	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	11	3	13	4.38
CACHE RIVER	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	0	0	3	4	1.33
CAIRN LAKE	2	9	7	55	4	10	0	0	0	0	13	67	5.15
CARP LAKE	11	29	19	375	15	63	0	0	3	16	48	483	10.06

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
CEPH LAKE	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.00
CHATTERTON LAKE	7	78	9	195	5	28	0	0	2	2	23	303	13.17
CIRRUS LAKE	14	161	11	156	14	75	4	7	1	6	44	405	9.20
CONE LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	4	1	13	0	0	2	17	8.50
CONK LAKE	1	25	1	1	2	20	0	0	0	0	4	46	11.50
CONMEE LAKE	3	27	4	39	3	8	0	0	0	0	10	74	7.40
CROOKED LAKE	4	170	5	63	6	35	0	0	1	2	16	270	16.87
CUB LAKE	3	63	1	50	2	30	0	0	0	0	6	143	23.83
CYPRESS LAKE	1	1	1	53	1	6	0	0	0	0	3	60	20.00
DAHLIN LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	1	26	2	32	16.00
DARKY LAKE	8	111	14	262	7	6	3	20	4	7	36	406	11.27
DELL LAKE	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	4.00
DORE LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	9	0	0	4	10	2.50
DRAPER LAKE	0	0	1	12	1	7	0	0	0	0	2	19	9.50
EAST LAKE	1	12	1	8	2	10	0	0	0	0	4	20	5.00
EDGE LAKE	0	0	1	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	23	23.00
ELIZABETH LAKE	3	19	2	12	5	25	0	0	0	0	10	56	5.60

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
ELK LAKE	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	8	8.00
EMARALD LAKE	3	8	14	273	2	5	0	0	1	2	20	288	14.40
FERGUSON LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	16	1	6	0	0	2	22	11.00
FERN LAKE	4	43	6	72	4	31	0	0	0	0	14	146	10.42
FRED LAKE	2	19	2	33	3	13	0	0	0	0	7	65	9.28
FRENCH LAKE	3	43	3	7	2	3	1	5	0	0	9	58	6.44
FRENCH RIVER	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.00
GARDNER BAY	2	25	2	28	1	21	0	0	1	2	6	76	12.66
GLACIER LAKE	1	1	6	82	4	72	0	0	1	4	12	159	13.25
GRATTON LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	10	0	0	1	3	2	13	6.50
GREY LAKE	0	0	1	15	0	0	0	0	2	5	3	20	6.66
HERONSHAW LAKE	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	13	13.00
ISABELIA LAKE	0	0	3	25	4	9	0	0	0	0	7	34	4.85
JEAN LAKE	16	174	21	405	15	157	9	38	1	7	62	781	12.59
JEFF LAKE	0	0	1	13	1	5	0	0	2	53	4	71	17.75

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
JESSIE LAKE	17	266	2	11	11	99	0	0	0	0	30	376	12.53
JOYCE LAKE	2	3	1	30	0	0	0	0	1	15	4	48	12.00
KAHSHAHPIWI LAKE	13	137	4	40	1	2	6	11	0	0	24	190	7.97
KASAKOKWOG LAKE	0	0	4	26	7	31	1	10	0	0	12	67	5.58
KAWNIPI LAKE	72	928	76	1137	72	1034	1	3	4	7	225	3109	13.81
KEATS LAKE	3	73	7	111	10	34	1	1	0	0	21	219	10.42
KEEFER LAKE	4	40	4	100	1	1	2	2	0	0	11	143	13.00
KENNY LAKE	3	12	5	47	3	20	0	0	0	0	11	79	7.18
KNIFE LAKE	2	5	5	115	4	23	0	0	3	15	14	158	11.28
LAC LA CROIX	3	10	3	33	4	5	0	0	0	0	10	48	4.80
LONELY LAKE	2	7	4	81	5	35	0	0	1	2	12	125	10.41
LOST BAY	0	0	2	58	3	23	0	0	1	1	6	82	13.66
LOUISA LAKE	1	6	1	2	2	15	6	37	0	0	10	60	6.00
MACK LAKE	5	96	1	5	2	31	0	0	0	0	8	132	16.50
MALIGNE RIVER	2	13	3	12	1	1	0	0	0	0	6	25	4.16
MARIA LAKE	2	14	2	24	2	19	0	0	0	0	6	57	9.50

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
MCALPINE LAKE	1	3	2	13	4	11	1	1	0	0	8	28	3.50
MCAREE LAKE	11	264	10	238	6	68	1	10	1	10	29	590	20.34
MCDOUGALL LAKE	0	0	1	30	1	2	1	9	0	0	3	41	13.66
MCEWEN LAKE	1	7	15	395	10	114	8	35	1	1	35	552	15.77
MCINTYRE LAKE	2	8	8	123	2	3	3	13	2	4	17	151	8.88
MCKENZIE LAKE	5	87	2	25	6	46	0	0	0	0	13	158	12.15
MCNAUGHT LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	18	0	0	1	42	2	60	30.00
MCNIECE LAKE	0	0	1	14	0	0	1	4	0	0	2	18	9.00
MEADOWS LAKE	1	5	8	87	1	5	0	0	4	127	14	224	16.00
MERRIAM BAY	0	0	2	9	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	11	2.75
MIDDLE ROLAND LAKE	1	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	2	5	2.50
MINN LAKE	4	38	5	159	3	34	0	0	0	0	12	231	19.25
MURDOCK LAKE	11	217	16	266	16	155	0	0	2	17	45	655	14.55
NEST LAKE	0	0	1	13	1	4	2	2	0	0	4	19	4.75
O M[illegible] AKE	[illegible]	[illegible]	1	[illegible]	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	43	10.75
												[illegible]	[illegible]

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
NORTH BAY	19	126	27	655	32	193	6	21	0	0	84	995	11.84
OLIFAUNT LAKE	6	187	8	132	5	107	2	6	1	1	22	433	19.68
OMEME LAKE	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	17	17.00
ORIANA LAKE	6	57	1	10	8	27	0	0	0	0	15	94	6.26
OTHER MAN LAKE	7	60	0	0	0	0	2	12	0	0	9	72	8.00
PICKEREL LAKE	77	731	96	1174	53	263	18	73	6	14	250	2255	9.02
PICKEREL RIVER	4	14	4	23	1	2	1	9	0	0	10	48	4.80
PLOUGH LAKE	0	0	2	58	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	59	19.66
POACHER LAKE	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	0	0	1	11	11.00
POINT LAKE	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	4	36	5	41	8.20
POND LAKE	0	0	2	47	2	23	1	2	0	0	5	72	14.40
POOHBAH LAKE	7	119	2	30	2	23	0	0	1	1	12	173	14.41
PULLING LAKE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	40	2	40	20.00
QUETICO LAKE	30	359	47	633	31	310	10	58	2	4	120	1364	11.36
RANGER BAY	0	0	0	0	1	22	0	0	0	0	1	22	22.00
RAWN LAKE	6	71	7	60	5	27	0	0	0	0	18	158	8.77
ROBIN LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	12	0	0	0	0	1	12	12.00
ROBINSON LAKE	3	26	7	74	3	32	1	3	0	0	14	135	9.64

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL		AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
											GROUPS	SPECIES CAUGHT	
ROLAND LAKE	0	0	1	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	42	42.00
ROUGE LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1.00
RUSSELL LAKE	20	328	17	243	18	128	0	0	1	3	56	702	12.53
SAGANAGA LAKE	1	30	5	105	4	37	0	0	0	0	10	172	17.20
SAGANAGONS LAKE	34	367	41	650	42	438	0	0	6	13	123	1468	11.93
SARAH LAKE	8	58	23	431	8	33	13	61	2	84	54	667	12.35
SARK LAKE	0	0	5	24	5	20	1	2	2	4	13	50	3.84
SHADE LAKE	0	0	1	17	3	4	3	11	2	3	9	35	3.88
SHELLEY LAKE	3	26	3	15	2	11	0	0	0	0	8	52	6.50
SHERIDAN LAKE	2	7	4	45	1	3	0	0	0	0	7	55	7.85
SIDE LAKE	0	0	2	28	1	4	2	3	1	70	6	105	17.50
SILENCE LAKE	25	73	35	373	13	42	0	0	3	17	76	505	6.64
SILVER FALLS RIVER	4	35	3	75	2	31	0	0	1	0	10	139	13.90
SLATE LAKE	1	2	1	6	3	11	0	0	0	0	5	19	3.80
SOHO LAKE	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	10.00
STURGEON LAKE	46	479	30	484	37	251	3	14	1	1	117	1229	10.50

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
SULTRY LAKE	1	2	7	60	3	6	1	1	0	0	12	73	6.08
SUMMER LAKE	0	0	1	7	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	8	4.00
SUNDAY LAKE	17	57	35	593	20	95	5	37	7	72	84	854	10.16
TANNER LAKE	4	84	3	103	3	48	0	0	1	1	11	236	21.45
THAT MAN LAKE	1	1	4	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	86	17.20
THIS MAN LAKE	5	39	2	25	0	0	3	4	0	0	10	68	6.80
TRANT LAKE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	17	3	17	5.66
TROUSER LAKE	0	0	0	0	1	14	0	0	0	0	1	14	14.00
TUCK LAKE	0	0	1	8	0	0	1	2	1	4	3	14	4.66
VERNON LAKE	0	0	1	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	38	38.00
WAWIAG RIVER	1	1	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	2	5	2.50
WALTER LAKE	5	47	8	87	5	33	2	4	0	0	20	171	8.55
WEST BAY	1	45	1	38	1	12	0	0	0	0	3	95	31.66
WEST LAKE	0	0	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	3	5	1.66
WET LAKE	3	16	10	255	5	55	0	0	0	0	18	326	13.11
WICKSTEED LAK	0	0	0	0	3	14	0	0	2	2	5	16	3.20
WOLSELEY LAKE	0	0	2	9	2	13	0	0	0	0	4	22	5.50

1984 INTERIOR VISITOR SURVEY

QUETICO PROV. PARK

LAKES WHERE SPIECIES CAUGHT

TABLE 11.2

(838 CASES = 68.0%)

	# OF GROUPS	WALLEYE	# OF GROUPS	BASS	# OF GROUPS	PIKE	# OF GROUPS	TROUT	# OF GROUPS	OTHER	TOTAL GROUPS	TOTAL SPECIES CAUGHT	AVERAGE # OF SPECIES CAUGHT PER LAKE
YOUR LAKE	3	46	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	5	53	10.60
YUM YUM LAKE	1	4	3	33	3	9	1	6	0	0	8	52	6.50
BAYLEA BAY	3	20	9	136	10	46	1	1	3	7	26	210	8.07
EMMA BAY	3	8	2	9	3	18	0	0	1	1	9	36	4.00
SUZANNETTE	2	40	4	37	1	37	1	1	0	0	8	115	14.37
OTHER	100	1199	159	2804	131	1132	29	146	35	265	454	5546	12.21
	863	9531	1235	19819	951	7425	233	1095	155	1223	3437	39093	11.37

Other . - Lakes identified on questionnaire but not listed in Quetico Fisheries Publication.

- LAKES THAT ARE NOT LISTED HAD 'O' RESPONSES PERTAINING TO FISHING PRESSURE
- Table 11.1 and 11.2 do not correspond in the following catagories because:

total # of fish caught - in chart 11.2 a number of respondents indicated they caught fish but did not give a lake location thus # of fish caught lower

total # of groups - in chart 11.2, groups may have fished on several lakes, counted more than once thus increasing number of groups

average species caught per group - in chart 11.2 groups may have fished on several lakes, groups counted more than once thus lowering the average species/group

17 a) Are you familiar with the commercial services available from Ontario based outfitters?
(1) Yes (2) No

b) Did your group (registered on your permit) use Ontario based outfitting services? (ie. watercraft and camping equipment rental, food, trip planning guides.)
(1) Yes (2) No (If Yes, continue. If No, skip to Question 17d.)

c) Please estimate your total expenditures (to the nearest dollar) for these services $

d) If available, would you utilize commercial aircraft drop-off or pick up services at Park ranger stations?
(1) Yes (2) No

5 1 1 2

18. If you fished during your trip, which of the following species were caught?

a) Walleye
- number kept
- number released
- lakes where species caught (Please write in your response.)

b) Smallmouth Bass
- number kept
- number released
- lakes where species caught (Please write in your response.)

c) Northern Pike
- number kept
- number released
- lakes where species caught (Please write in your response.)

d) Lake Trout
- number kept
- number released
- lakes where species caught (Please write in your response.)

e) Other (please specify)
- number kept
- number released
- lakes where species caught (Please write in your response.)

Please deposit in Survey Box at any permit issuing office in the Park. Thank you for your assistance.

If accidentally carried from the Park, please mail to Parks and Recreational Areas Branch
Ministry of Natural Resources
Queen's Park
Toronto, Ontario M7A 1W3

Ministry of Natural Resources
Ontario

Interior Visitor Survey – Quetico Provincial Park

Entry Point

Park Code: 5 1 1 | Questionnaire Number | Record Number: 1

Help plan your Provincial Parks. Please fill out this Questionnaire.

This questionnaire is designed to give you, the park user, an opportunity to express your views on the Interior Management of Quetico Provincial Park. Your responses will greatly assist park planners and managers.

Instructions: Unless otherwise specified, please enter one number in the appropriate box to facilitate comuter processing. Do not fill in the shaded boxes (for office use only).
Example – If your response to Question 3b is 12 visits, then code 1 2

1. Which of the following best describes your group? (Select one only.)
(1) Family (2) One couple only (3) Organized group (ie. troop, team, etc.)
(4) Group of friends (5) Single (9) Other (please specify)

2 a) How many people are in your group? (Registered on your permit.)

b) If your group is part of a larger travelling party, how many people in total, are in your party?

3. a) Have you travelled in the Interior of Quetico Provincial Park before?
(1) Yes (2) No (If Yes, continue. If No, skip to Question 4.)

b) How many visits did you make to the Interior of Quetico last year (1983)?

c) How many days in total did you spend in the Quetico Interior last year (1983)?

4. Where is your permanent residence located?

Nearest Village, Town, City

Province, State, Country

5. What prompted your visit to the Interior of Quetico this year? (Select one only.)
(1) Magazine article/advertisement (2) Newspaper article/advertisement
(3) Radio, TV advertisements (4) Provincial Parks publication
(5) Previous trips to Quetico Interior (6) Quetico 75th anniversary (7) Friend/Relative
(8) Road sign/Map (9) Other (please specify) (10) Commercial outfitter
(11) Parks/tourism Information Centre

6. What is the purpose of your visit? (Please write in your response.)

1155 (R2/4)

Please fill out the remaining questions just before leaving the Park.

7. How many nights did you camp on this visit? 29 [ ] 30

8. How many different interior campsites did you use? 31 [ ] 32

9. a) Are you aware of the reservation service?
(1) Yes (2) No (If Yes, continue. If No, skip to Question 10.) [ ] 33

b) Did you make use of it?
(1) Yes (2) No (If Yes, continue. If No, skip to Question 10.) [ ] 34

c) Was your first choice of entry point and starting date accepted?
(1) Yes (2) No [ ] 35

d) Are you satisfied with the reservation service?
(1) Yes (2) No [ ] 36

e) Any suggested improvements? (Please write in your response.) ▼
37 [ ] 38

10. a) Did you experience crowding within the Interior?
(1) Yes (2) No (If Yes, continue. If No, skip to Question 11.) [ ] 39

b) Was this crowding experienced,
en route? (1) Yes (2) No [ ] 40
while locating a campsite? (1) Yes (2) No [ ] 41
at portages? (1) Yes (2) No [ ] 42

11. a) There have been suggestions that float plane flights over the Park are acceptable to visitors. What is your view?
(1) Agree (2) Disagree (3) No opinion [ ] 43

b) Has this trip been affected by aircraft flights over the Park?
(1) Yes (2) No (If Yes, continue. If No, skip to Question 12.) [ ] 44

c) Please explain. (Write in your response.) ▼
[ ] 45
[ ] 46

12. a) In 1985, the maximum group size (number of people registered on one permit and using one campsite) will be reduced from 9 to 6. Do you agree with this reduction?
(1) Yes (2) No (If No, continue. If Yes, then skip to Question 13.) [ ] 47

b) Please explain. (Write in your response.) ▼
[ ] 48

13. a) Was litter a problem at:
(1) Campsites? (2) Portages? (3) En route? (4) Entry stations?
(5) All of the above? (6) Non of the above?
1st location [ ] 49
2nd location [ ] 50
3rd location [ ] 51

b) Do you have any suggestions regarding controlling litter in the Interior other than the can and bottle ban and the provision of a litter bag? (Please write in your response.) ▼
[ ] 52

c) It has been suggested that box toilets be installed on campsites. What is your opinion?
(1) Agree (2) Disagree (3) No opinion [ ] 53

14. a) Are you satisfied with the information on the current canoe route map?
(1) Yes (2) No (If No, please explain.) ▼
[ ] 54
[ ] 55

b) Is the Park literature adequate?
(1) Yes (2) No (If No, please write in suggestions for additional information.) ▼
[ ] 56
[ ] 57
[ ] 58

c) Would you be willing to pay for Park literature?
(1) Yes (2) No [ ] 59

15. Were you aware of the following Park rules prior to your arrival?

a) Can and bottle ban
(1) Yes (2) No [ ] 60

b) Restriction on live-bait fish
(1) Yes (2) No [ ] 61

c) Group size of 9 per campsite
(1) Yes (2) No [ ] 62

d) Outboard motor ban
(1) Yes (2) No [ ] 63

16. The following questions pertain to your satisfaction with the management of Quetico's Interior. Please answer each question and indicate your recommendations where appropriate.

a) Portages
(1) Satisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) No opinion If dissatisfied, recommendations ▼
[ ] 64
[ ] 65

b) Hiking trails
(1) Satisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) No opinion If dissatisfied, recommendations ▼
[ ] 66
[ ] 67

c) Campsites
(1) Satisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) No opinion If dissatisfied, recommendations ▼
[ ] 68
[ ] 69

d) Park staff
(1) Satisfied (2) Dissatisfied (3) No opinion If dissatisfied, recommendations ▼
[ ] 70
[ ] 71

e) Did you encounter a Park ranger on your trip?
(1) Yes (2) No [ ] 72

Please see reverse side for Question 17.

QUETICO PROVINCIAL PARK